DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 653 CE 040 257

AUTHOR Berkey, Arthur L.; Sutphin, H. Dean
TITLE Status and Importance/Support for Supervised Occupational Experience Programs (SOEP) as Perceived by New York Vocational Agriculture Teachers and Their Administrators.
PUB DATE Dec 84
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the American Vocational Association Convention (New Orleans, LA, December 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Characteristics; *Agricultural Education; Educational Needs; Educational Practices; Needs Assessment; *Program Effectiveness; Program Improvement; Secondary Education; Statewide Planning; *Supervised Farm Practice; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Background; Teacher Characteristics; *Vocational Directors; *Vocational Education; *Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

A study examined the status of agricultural supervised occupational experience programs (SOEP) in the state of New York and also the attitudes of agricultural teachers and their building administrators toward SOEP. Two separate survey instruments were used to gather data for the study--one survey was mailed to 333 secondary vocational agriculture teachers and a second survey was mailed to 210 administrators of the individual schools in which these teachers taught. Of those originally contacted, 202 instructors and 131 administrators completed and returned questionnaires. It was found that school administrators are supportive of SOEP although they are less supportive of practices calling for an outlay of expenditures. Although agriculture teachers perceived SOEP as important, they were less supportive of practices dealing with summarizing SOEP data and filing annual reports. A majority of the teachers surveyed lacked the experience of having conducted SOEP as part of their high school education and thus had to rely on pre- or inservice education and other experiences to provide them with the competencies needed to guide their students through SOEP. More than one-third of the teachers surveyed have not received any SOEP-related instruction for college credit. To improve the delivery of SOEP in the state of New York, the following are needed: more inservice education dealing with SOEP, development of written policies and guidelines for SOEP, implementation of standardized recordkeeping procedures for SOEP, and design of an evaluation procedure to monitor trends in SOEP in the State. (MN)

ED251653

STATUS AND IMPORTANCE/SUPPORT FOR SUPERVISED OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS(SOEP) AS PERCEIVED BY NEW YORK VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS AND THEIR ADMINISTRATORS

Arthur L. Berkey
Professor of Agricultural Education
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

H. Dean Sutphin
Assistant Professor of
Agricultural Education
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

INTRODUCTION/NEED FOR THE STUDY

Supervised occupational experience programs (SOEP) are a primary program component in need of improvement (Miller, 1983; Williams, 1983). A national workshop was conducted in July of 1982 for the purpose of improving SOEP nationwide. The challenge directed to individual states from the national workshop was to initiate efforts which would improve the quality of SOEP programs in their state and contribute to high quality programs at the national level. Boyle (1981) noted that an assessment of the current situation is an important component of program improvement/development. The attitude of program administrators and teachers (Stewart, Lighari, Gett, 1983) are important variables to investigate when reviewing agricultural education program components.

Guidelines, implementation strategies and resource materials for SOEP were developed and field tested for the Northeastern United States (Berkey and Sutphin, 1983) as part of a Cornell based Hatch funded regional research project. Information was needed to adapt these guidelines, implementation strategies and resource materials for use in New York State. Data on the status of SOEP, and the attitudes of administrators and teachers toward SOEP were needed as a basis for planning the implementation of these materials in New York State. Teacher educators, State Education Department staff and leaders of the State agricultural teacher's association (ATANY) in New York State are cooperatively planning the implementation effort.

Hence this research was needed to provide data for planning activities to strengthen agricultural SOEP in New York State.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to determine the status of agricultural supervised occupational experience programs in New York State, and the attitudes of agricultural teachers and their building administrators toward SOEP. This information will then be used to operationalize guidelines, implementation strategies and resource materials to improve SOEP in New York State.

CE040257

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A Berkey
H Sutphin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The specific objectives were to:

1. Describe background characteristics and demographic data concerning agricultural SOEP.

2. Determine the perceptions of agricultural teachers and their building administrators on the benefits, current practices, and the importance/support of selected factors related to SOEP.

3. Compare the perceptions of agricultural teachers and their building administrators with regard to the benefits of SOEP in agriculture, and current practice and importance/support of selected factors related to a high quality SOEP.

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Research Design

The research design was a form of the one-shot case study described by Campbell and Stanley (1963). The type of research was descriptive-correlational.

Population and Sample

The population for the study consisted of (a) New York secondary vocational agriculture teachers (N = 333) and (b) their building administrators (N = 210). The list of agriculture teachers was taken from the 1982-83 New York State Directory of Agriculture Programs and Teachers as compiled by the State Education Department. The list was validated by State Education Department Staff, the Director of the Cornell Instructional Materials Service, three agricultural education faculty members at Cornell University, and by follow-up phone calls when the status of prospective respondents was questionable. The title "building administrator" was used for the population of administrators in schools where agriculture was taught since there was no list of individual administrator names available. The total population of agriculture teachers and their building administrators was used as the sample for study.

Data Collection

Separate instruments were developed for vocational agriculture teachers and administrators based on a literature review and the objectives of the study. The teacher questionnaire consisted of questions on: (a) type of school; (b) teacher background in vocational agriculture, teaching experience and certification status; (c) type and scope of school laboratory facilities; (d) percentage of students in FFA; (e) type and scope of SOEP conducted; (f) teacher attitude toward the value of SOEP; and (g) current practice and importance regarding SOEP factors. The building administrator questionnaire addressed only: (a) their attitude toward the value of SOEP; and (b) current practice and their future support regarding SOEP factors. "Importance" ratings

by teachers were in terms of conducting high quality SOEP. Future "support" ratings by administrators indicated importance in the context of funding and implementing the factors associated with SOEP. A likert type scale was used for rating importance/support for items on the questionnaire.

Items on the teacher and administrator questionnaires were matched to allow for correlation of data between the two respondent groups in the statistical analysis procedures. Data were collected at either the nominal and interval levels to meet the objectives of the study. Respondents were assured that their individual responses would be kept confidential.

Content validity of the instruments was determined through review by a panel of experts. A Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was calculated for individual sections of each instrument. The Cronbach's alpha values for reliability were .85 and .89 for the agriculture teacher instrument, and .76 and .91 for the administrator questionnaire.

Questionnaires were mailed to the total population of New York vocational agriculture teachers and their building administrators. Two follow-up letters were mailed to respondents at two week intervals following the initial mailing. The response rate for teachers and administrators was 61% (202) and 62% (131), respectively.

A follow-up of non-respondents determined that they differed from respondents in one or more of the following characteristics; (1) did not consider their program to be part of agriculture (e.g. ornamental horticulture), (2) did not have SOEP, and/or (3) were located in the New York City area. The findings, conclusions and recommendations of this study must be interpreted in the context of these differences.

Data Analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was the computer program used for data analysis.

RESULTS: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

Teacher Characteristics

Over one-half (53.5%) of teachers responding taught farm production and management. The other specializations were represented in the approximate percentage that they represented of the total number of teachers in New York State. Small animal care (3.5%), horse handling and care (2%) and applied agricultural science and mechanics (1%) represented less than seven percent of respondents. The balance of agricultural specializations was distributed among the specializations of ornamental horticulture (15.8%), agricultural mechanization (13.9%) and conservation (10.4%).

Slightly less than half (47.5%) of teachers took vocational agriculture in high school. Of teachers taking agriculture, 96% were FFA members and 80% had some type of SOEP as a part of their agriculture program. As a percentage of all 202 teachers responding, only 46% were FFA members and 38% had SOEP.

Most of the teachers had at least six years of teaching experience. Sixty-two percent had six or more years of total experience, and 60% had six or more years in their present school. Almost one-half of teachers responding (49%) had 10 or more years experience at their present school.

In terms of college work related to SOEP, 18.3% of teachers had a college course on SOEP plus a course including SOEP. Of the remaining teachers, 40.1% had only a course including SOEP, 36.6% reported having no college course on SOEP, and five percent did not respond to the question. In summary, more than one teacher in three had taken no college instruction on conducting SEOP.

Three-quarters (74.8%) of teachers responding had permanent certification. Of the remainder, 20.3% had provisional certification, 3.5% held a certificate of default, and 1.5% did not respond to the question.

Program Characteristics

As could be anticipated, most schools (87.6%) have shops and over one-half (58.4%) have land laboratories. Approximately one-third have greenhouses and/or forestry woodlots. The 30 schools reporting other types of laboratory facilities listed private and rented facilities, sugar maple groves for maple syrup, sawmills, and nearby home farms.

The percentage (4.5%) of schools that reported having large animal laboratories means that the secondary students enrolled in farm production and management had limited in-school opportunity for SOEP with large animals despite New York State production agriculture having dairy as the largest enterprise.

More than one teacher in six (17.3%) reported having no students enrolled in FFA. Similarly, 16.8% reported less than 50% FFA membership. Almost one-half of teachers (46%) reported 100% FFA membership and the balance (20.4%) reported membership between 51% and 99%.

Status of Supervised Occupational Experience Programs

Only one-fourth (25.7%) of teachers reported having a written policy on SOEP. Of the 52 teachers with plans, 45 (86.5%) reported their plans had the approval of the school administration.

Table 1 shows that the number of programs with some level of SOEP increased from approximately one-half in grade nine to approximately 90% in grade 12. However, as shown in Table 2, the percentage of student participation did not increase accordingly.

Table 1

Number Of Teachers Reporting
SOEPs By Grade Level (N=202)

Grade Level	Programs W/O SOEP		Programs With SOEP		Total
	F	%	F	%	%
Nine	97	48	105	52	100
Ten	78	38.6	124	61.4	100
Eleven	16	7.9	186	92.1	100
Twelve	21	10.4	181	89.6	100

F = Frequency

The data in Table 2 shows two trends. First that the total number of students enrolled in Grade 11 increased almost one-half over grade 10, and then dropped back to a 15% increase in grade 12. This could be explained by students entering area occupational centers in grade 11, and/or grade 12 classes typically being smaller than grade 11 due to attrition.

Table 2

Student SOEP Status
By Grade Level

Grade Level	Total Students in Class	Students W/O SOEP		Students With SOEP		Students Completing 300+ Hours	
	F	F	%	F	%	F	%
Nine	1685	886	52.6	799	47.4	535	31.8
Ten	1656	884	53.4	772	46.6	518	31.3
Eleven	2382	1621	68.1	761	31.9	547	23.0
Twelve	1897	1253	66.1	644	43.9	504	26.6
Total	7620	4644	60.9	2976	39.1	2104	27.6

F = Frequency

The second trend was that the overall percentage of students with some level of SOEP ranges from a low of 31.9% in grade 11 to 47.4% in grade 9. A related trend was that the percentage of students with SOEP of 300 or more hours is 23% for grade 11 and 31.8% in grade nine.

Overall, less than three out of 10 (27.6%) agriculture students enrolled in courses reported by teachers had an SOEP of 300 or more hours. Data on non-respondents indicated less SOEP activity than respondents which means that the percentage for all students completing SOEPs with 300 plus hours is probably even lower than 27.6%.

Data on the category of individuals who made visits to students' SOEP work sites showed that over half (56.9%) of visits are made by the teacher who had the student in class. The next highest category was visits by the cooperative education coordinator at 13.9%. Almost one-fourth (23.3%) of teachers did not make any SOEP visits.

Teachers varied in the types of units on SOEP taught in class. The relationship between classroom instruction, the FFA and SOEP was taught by slightly more than one-half (55.4%) of teachers. Other units on SOEP planning and selection were taught by approximately one-third of teachers. One-third (33.7%) of teachers did not respond to the question at all.

The record book most commonly used by teachers for SOEP was the New York book published by the Cornell Instructional Materials Service followed by the books from the National FFA Supply Service, French Bray and Interstate. Almost one-third (31.2%) of teachers reported using no record book, and 14.4% did not respond to the question.

Data were collected on the average number of visits made to students' SOEP during the school year and the summer. Slightly over three out of 10 (30.7%) students received one visit during the school year and 25.7% received more than one visit. In contrast, during the summer only 18.8% of students received one visit, and 24.3% received more than one summer visit. The percent of students receiving no visits at all was 30.2%. The percent of teachers not responding to the question was 13.4% for the school year and 26.7% for summer.

Data were collected on how far the most distant student's home was from the school to provide an idea of maximum travel distance for home based SOEP. Approximately one-third (33.6%) of teachers reported students living within 10 miles, 35.2% of teachers had all students living within 20 miles, and 31.2% of teachers had students living more than 20 miles from school.

The percentage of the course grade allocated to SOEP provides an indication of the importance of SOEP in the vocational agriculture program. Approximately four out of 10 (41.6%) teachers did not include SOEP as part of the course grade. One-fourth (25.8%) assigned one to 10% of the total grade for SOEP. Only 15.8% of teachers assigned 11-20%

of grades for SOEP, and 5.9% grade 21% or more on SOEP. The percentage of teachers not responding to the question was 9.9%.

An annual summary of SOEP was completed by only 5.9% of teachers. Of the remainder, 84.7% responded that they had not made a compilation of student SOEP activities and 9.4% did not respond. All teachers who compiled an annual summary filed such with their school administration.

Teacher Competence in SOEP

Teachers were asked to assess their need for additional competence in SOEP. One-half of the teachers indicated a "High or Medium need" for additional competence in SOEP. Approximately one-third (36.1%) reported "Low or No need", and 13.9% did not respond.

Benefits of SOEP in Agriculture

Teachers and administrators independently rated the benefits of SOEP on a five point likert type scale (1="Strongly Agree" to 5="Strongly Disagree"). Mean scores for both teachers and administrators were computed for the four benefit statements.

Teacher and administrator ratings were similar for three of the four benefits related to SOEP. These three statements were concerned with development of favorable work attitudes, values and habits; development of technical knowledge and skills; and general benefits to the vocational agriculture program, school and community. Teacher means were 4.2 for all three benefits, and administrator ratings were 4.2, 4.2 and 4.3 respectively.

Teachers and administrators differed significantly in their ratings of the fourth benefit statement of "SOEP as well as FFA and in-class instruction is necessary for a high quality vocational agriculture program." The mean teacher rating was 3.2 as compared to the administrator rating of 4.2. An independent T-Test applied to the data indicated a significant difference on the fourth benefit factor at the .05 level (T=2.66 and P=.0008). No significant differences were found on the first three benefits related to SOEP.

Current Practice and Importance/Support of SOEP Factors

Teacher and administrator responses to current practice, and to importance (by teachers) and support (by administrators) of SOEP factors are presented in Table 3. Both teachers and administrators rated current practice for the 12 SOEP factors on a "Yes" - "No" basis. Teachers also rated the importance of the factors on a four point likert scale ranging from "Not Important" (1) to "Essential" (4). Similarly, administrators rated their support for the factors on a four point scale of "No Support" (1) to "Strongly Support" (4). The "importance" and "support" scales were assumed equivalent for the purposes of analysis in this study. Chi-square values were calculated to determine if significant differences existed between teacher and administrators on current practice ("Yes" or "No" responses) for the SOEP factors. Statistical

Table 3

Percentage of Teacher and Administrator Responses to Current Practice, and Importance/Support of Factors Related to SOEP

Factor		Current Practice (%)			Importance/Support (%)				
		Yes	No		NI / NS	LI / LS	I / S	E / SS	NR
Participation in SOEP is a requirement for all agricultlture students	T	12.4	81.2	6.4	5.0	27.7	35.1	10.4	21.8
	A	19.11	72.5	8.4	8.4	26.4	37.4	17.6	12.2
Students are informed of the SOEP requirement before they enroll in agriculture	T	25.2	64.4	10.4	8.9	26.4	28.7	11.4	24.3
	A	38.2	48.1	13.7	13.1	14.5	42	23.7	16.8
One class period is provided to the teacher for supervision	T	6.9	83.7	9.4	8.9	14.4	33.7	17.8	25.7
	A	12.2	72.4	15.3	18.3	24.4	21.4	14.5	21.4
More than one period is provided for SOEP supervision when justified by enrollment	T	16.8	69.3	13.9	8.9	15.8	29.7	15.8	29.7
	A	17.6	67.2	15.3	19.1	21.4	32.1	9.2	18.3
A school vehicle is provided for supervision	T	39.6	49.5	10.9	6.9	14.9	32.2	17.8	28.2
	A	44.3	45.8	9.9	10.7	16.0	38.2	18.3	16.8
Mileage reimbursement is provided for SOEP supervision travel	T	42.1	43.6	14.4	5.0	10.4	29.2	22.8	32.7
	A	48.9	37.4	13.7	6.1	9.9	36.6	28.2	19.1
Summer employment is provided for SOEP supervision	T	41.6	51.0	7.4	5.0	6.9	21.8	39.4	26.7
	A	40.5	50.4	9.2	13.0	9.9	32.1	26.0	19.1
SOEP opportunities are provided to all students including the disadvantaged and handicapped	T	51.3	36.6	11.9	3.0	11.4	40.6	18.8	26.2
	A	60.3	26.0	13.7	3.1	6.1	47.3	28.2	15.3
Coordination with guidance counselor to accommodate student student SOEP	T	24.8	65.8	9.4	6.9	14.9	37.1	14.4	26.7
	A	48.9	38.9	12.2	7.6	13.0	41.2	18.3	19.8
Additional credit toward graduation to be given to students who have more than 300 hours SOEP each year	T	22.8	68.8	8.4	11.8	17.8	35.1	7.4	28.2
	A	17.6	67.9	14.5	13.7	23.7	29.0	13.7	19.8
New guidance or administrative personnel are oriented on SOEP	T	10.9	79.7	9.4	7.4	15.3	33.7	13.9	29.7
	A	16.8	70.2	13.0	6.9	18.3	41.2	16.0	17.6
Annual SOEP review/report is conducted	T	9.4	72.3	18.3	8.9	14.9	32.7	7.9	35.6
	A	33.6	55.0	11.5	3.8	16.0	45.8	17.6	16.8

T = Agriculture Teacher; A = Administrator; NR = No Response
Administrator questionnaire coding NS=No Support(1); LS=Limited Support(2); S=Support (3); SS=Strongly Support (4)
Teacher questionnaire coding NI=Not Important (1); LI=Limited Importance (2); I=Important (3); E=Essential (4)

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations and T-Values on the Importance/Support of SOEP Practices by Agriculture Instructors and their Administrators

Factor	Ag. Teacher			Building Administrator			T-Value
	Mean[a]	S.D.	n	Mean[b]	S.D.	n	
Participation in SOEP is a requirement for all agriculture students	2.65	.789	158	2.75	.892	[illegible]	-0.77
Students are informed of the SOEP requirement before they enroll in agriculture	2.56	.687	153	3.03	.781	109	-4.48[c]
One class period to provide to the teacher for supervision	2.81	.939	150	2.41	1.043	103	3.17
More than one period is provided for SOEP supervision when justified by enrollment	2.75	.949	142	2.38	.968	107	2.97
School vehicle is provided for supervision	2.85	.908	145	2.77	.939	109	.66
Mileage reimbursement is provided for SOEP supervision travel	3.04	.890	136	3.08	.880	106	-0.34
Summer employment is provided for SOEP supervision	3.31	.902	148	2.88	1.039	106	3.54[c]
SOEP opportunities are provided to all students including the disadvantaged and handicapped	3.02	.758	149	3.19	.720	111	-1.82
Coordination with guidance counselor accommodate student SOEP	2.80	.862	148	2.88	.874	105	-0.65
Additional credit toward graduation to be given to students who have more than 300 hours SOEP each year	2.54	.882	145	2.53	.971	105	.04
New guidance or administrative personnel are oriented on SOEP	2.77	.889	142	2.81	.868	108	-.34
Annual SOEP review/report is conducted	2.42	.675	130	2.93	.764	109	-2.90[c]

a = Teachers rated each statement on a 1-4 scale (1 = "Not important" to 4 = "Essential")
b = Administrators rated each statement on a 1-4 scale (1 = "No support" to 4 = "Strong support")
c = Significant at .05

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

comparisons of teacher and administrator mean ratings for importance/support using independent T-Tests were also calculated and are included in Table 4.

Current Practice for SOEP Factors - Teacher and administrator "Yes" or "No" responses for current practice for four of the 12 SOEP factors were found to be significantly different as determined by Chi-Square tests at the .05 probability level. The four factors were: students being informed in advance of the SOEP requirements; SOEP opportunities being available to all students including those with special needs; coordination with guidance counselors on SOEP; and conducting an annual report/review.

Other findings on current practice (Table 3) were that only 12.4% of teachers required SOEP for all students, and 25.2% informed students about SOEP before enrollment in agriculture. Only 23.7% of teachers had one period per day or additional released time for SOEP supervision, and approximately 40% of teachers had access to a school vehicle or received mileage reimbursement for SOEP visits.

Summer employment was reported by 41.6% of teachers, but only 17.8% reported being hired 21 or more days during the summer period. Opportunities for SOEP by all students was reported by 51.5% of teachers and 60.3% of administrators. More administrators (48.9%) than teachers (24.8%) reported coordination with guidance counselors to accommodate student SOEPs as a current practice. Similarly, 33.6% of administrators compared to only 9.4% of teachers reported that an annual review/report of SOEP is written.

Although not directly related to the objectives of the study, an interesting finding was that the percentage of both teachers and administrators not responding (NR) to current practice for the 12 factors was lower in every case than their level of non-response to the same items for importance/support (Table 3). For example, on SOEP factor one, 6.4% of teachers did not respond to current practice and 21.5% did not answer the importance rating. This may be explained by "current practice" being an issue of fact where "importance" and "support" responses involved judgements and assumptions for the future.

Importance/Support of SOEP Factors - As shown in Table 4, mean scores for the practice "students are informed of the SOEP requirement before they enroll in agriculture class" were 2.6 and 3.0 for teachers and administrators, respectively. Conversely, teachers rated the importance of "employed during the summer for SOEP supervision" higher than did administrators with mean scores of 3.3 and 2.9 respectively. Administrator mean score ratings were 2.9 for the importance of conducting an annual review/report of SOEP while the mean score for teachers was 2.6. All mean scores were at the 2.5 level or higher for teachers and 2.9 or higher for administrators.

Significant differences between teacher and administrator importance/support ratings (.05 level using the independent T-Test) were found to exist on three of 12 SOEP factors which were "Students are in-

formed of the SOEP requirement before they enroll in agriculture class"; "The agriculture teacher is employed during the summer for SOEP supervision"; and "An annual review/report by SOEP in agriculture is conducted by the agriculture teacher and filed with the administration."

Conclusions

Based on the findings from the data the following conclusions were formulated. The reader is reminded that non-respondents were different from respondents in some respects as previously described in the section on follow-up non-respondents.

1. A majority of New York vocational agriculture teachers lack the experience of having conducted SOEP as part of their high school education and thus must depend on preservice and/or inservice education or other experiences to provide them with the competencies needed to conduct SOEP as part of their students' vocational agriculture program.

2. More than one-third of New York vocational agriculture teachers have not received SOEP related instruction for college credit through either pre-service or inservice teacher training programs. Therefore, inservice education on SOEP is needed.

3. School laboratories are potential viable sources of in-school type SOEP since over 50% of the schools had land laboratories and more than one-third had either greenhouses or forestry plots.

4. Incentive programs are available to New York State vocational agriculture students to encourage participation in SOEP through the FFA national awards program since more than 80% of the schools have FFA programs.

5. New York vocational agriculture teachers can strengthen their SOEP programs by development of, and administrative approval for, written policies on SOEP. Only 25% have written policies/plans for SOEP.

6. Vocational agriculture teachers are more likely to include SOEP as part of the agricultural education program in grades 11 and 12 than in grades 9 and 10.

7. The low (less than 29%) number of New York vocational agriculture students completing SOEP of more than 300 hours a year should be increased to improve the quality of SOEP in the state.

8. Record keeping for SOEP is not stressed in New York vocational agriculture programs nor is there one standard record book used by all departments.

9. Administrators and agriculture teachers have similar views that benefits result from conducting SOEP, although administrators perceive that SOEP is more important for a quality vocational agri-

culture program than do agricultural teachers. Thus teacher attitude may need to be changed before SOEP quality can be increased.

10. School administrators are supportive of SOEP, although, they are less supportive of practices that call for an outlay of expenditures.

11. Agriculture teachers perceive SOEP as important; but are less supportive of practices that deal with summarizing SOEP data and filing annual reports.

12. The SOEP component of vocational agriculture in New York State needs to be improved in order to meet the standards specified in "A Guide For Implementing Standards For Quality Occupational Programs In Agricultural Education, 1979".

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings and conclusions for this research:

1. The preservice teacher training program in New York should be reviewed to determine if SOEP competencies are being developed, and appropriate action should be taken based on this analysis.

2. A comprehensive inservice program to develop needed SOEP competencies should be planned and implemented in New York State which would address:

   a. Opportunities for school based SOEP

   b. Relationship of SOEP and FFA and related incentives through FFA

   c. Procedures to develop written policies regarding SOEP and obtaining administrative approval of these policies

   d. Opportunities for SOEP in grades 9 and 10

   e. Teacher lesson plans that are needed to implement SOEP

   f. Development of teacher competence in SOEP record keeping

   g. Importance of coordinating and communicating SOEP activities with school administrators and guidance counselors.

3. Alternative options to implement inservice SOEP activities should be explored including cooperative efforts between the state education department, the Agricultural Teachers Association of New York, and Cornell University.

4. A study should be conducted every two years in order to monitor trends in SOEP in New York State.

References

Berkey, A. and Sutphin, D. Guidelines and implementation strategies for quality supervised occupational experience programs (SOEP) in the Northeast region. New York: Cornell University, 1983.

Boyle, P.G. Planning better programs. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Campbell, D. T. and Stanley, J. D. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1963.

Miller, L. E. Supervised occupational experience programs (editor's age). The Agricultural Education Magazine. 55 (9), 3.

Stewart, B. k., Lighari, L. and Gott, R. E. Administrators' perceptions of professional education competencies needed by teachers of vocational agricuilture. Journal of the American Assocation of Teacher Educators in Agriculture. 24 (3), 22-23.

Williams, D. L. Theme: Achieving quality supervised occupational experience programs. The Agricultural Education Magazine. 55 (9), 4.